

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 19-21, and 23-25 were presented for examination and were rejected. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the following comments.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-13, 19-21, and 23-25

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 19-21, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over B. Appelman, World Application 03/098425 (hereinafter "Appelman") in view of S. M. Armstrong et al., U.S. Patent 6,807,423 (hereinafter "Armstrong"). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method comprising:

receiving an email message from a sender;

obtaining a presence status of the sender from a presence server, wherein the presence status indicates a presence status of the sender across plurality of domains;

delivering the email message to a recipient with an indication of a presence of the sender on one or more of the domains; and

wherein the presence server determines the presence status of the sender *based on a rule that aggregates at least two items of presence information that are conflicting with each other.*

(emphasis supplied)

Neither Appelman nor Armstrong, alone or in combination, teach or suggest what claim 1 recites — namely, an arrangement where the presence server determines the presence status of the sender based on a rule that aggregates at least two items of presence information that are conflicting with each other.

The Office has acknowledged that Appelman does not teach or suggest the limitation "wherein the presence server determines the presence status of the sender based on a rule that aggregates at least two items of presence information that are conflicting with each other".

The applicants respectfully submit that new reference Armstrong also does not teach or suggest this feature. The applicants acknowledge that in the passages cited by the Office (Col. 4, line 49 – Col. 5, line 9; Col. 6 lines 48-61; Col. 7, lines 4-19) Armstrong does teach

aggregating multiple presence information items into a single point of presence. For example, in accordance with Armstrong, there might be:

- a first item that indicates that a particular user is connected to a first network via a first device (for example, a CDMA network via a cell phone);
- a second item that indicates that the user is also connected to a second network via a second device (for example, a Wi-Fi network via an Apple iPad®); and
- a third item that indicates that the user should preferably be contacted via the first device;

and Armstrong will in fact aggregate these items into a single *point of presence*. The applicants respectfully submit that such aggregation is well-known in the prior art. However, nowhere does Armstrong — in the cited passages or elsewhere — teach or suggest *how to determine the presence status of a user when multiple items of presence information conflict with each other*. For example, consider the following items of presence information:

- a first item that indicates that a particular user is connected to a network via a device (for example, a CDMA network via a cell phone);
- a second item that, based on the user's Microsoft Outlook® calendar, indicates that the user is currently available for a call; and
- a third item that, based on the user's on-line Google® calendar, indicates that the user is not currently available for a call (e.g., the Google® calendar indicates that the user is currently in a meeting, etc.).

In the foregoing example, the second item and third item conflict with each other. In the present invention, as recited in claim 1, the presence server consults an appropriate rule in a rule base to resolve this conflict and determine the presence status of the user.

Armstrong, in contrast, mentions nothing about multiple items of presence information that conflict with each other — let alone how to resolve the conflict and determine a user's presence status.

For this reason, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Appelman and Armstrong, and that the rejection is traversed.

Because claims 2-3 and 5-13 depend on claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims is also traversed.

Claim 19 recites:

19. An apparatus comprising:
a memory; and
at least one processor, coupled to the memory, operative to:
receive an email message from a sender;
obtain a presence status of the sender from a presence server,
wherein the presence status indicates a presence status of the sender across
a plurality of domains;
deliver the email message to a recipient with an indication of a
presence of the sender on one or more of the plurality of domains; and
wherein the presence server determines the presence status of the
sender *based on a rule that aggregates at least two items of presence
information that are conflicting with each other.*
(emphasis supplied)

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 19 is traversed.

Because claims 20-21 and 23-35 depend on claim 19, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims is also traversed.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
Shabbir A. Khakoo et al.

By /David M. Lazoff/
David M. Lazoff
DeMont & Breyer, LLC
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42783
732-687-7427

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America